British Nationalist
FOR RACE AND NATION
FEBRUARY 1991
25p

GULF WAR: MOSLEM THREAT

Revealed: the inevitable conflict of loyalties in a multi-racial society

FOR YEARS, our paper has warned the British public about the appalling consequences likely to result from the policies of successive governments aimed at turning this country into a multi-racial, multi-cultural society. One of these consequences is the creation of a population with divided loyalties. Now, with the emergence of the Gulf War, this is being borne out. A very large part of Britain's growing Moslem community is sympathetic to Saddam Hussein and therefore constitutes a potential source of fifth-columnists in our midst. This is just one more danger for which we have to thank our purblind rulers.

Let us get things absolutely straight. This paper has opposed the involvement of Britain in the Gulf conflict. We believe the decision to send British forces to the Gulf was wrong. It would have been better to leave the Arabs in the region to sort out their own quarrel.

But now that British forces are in the Gulf War, the only thing we can do is support them in the task of winning the war as soon as possible, so that they can then be brought home with minimum loss of life. This means that we need to have the nation united behind the men fighting in the Gulf.

But because Britain is now a 'multi-racial' and 'multi-cultural' country, with many conflicting ethnic groups and faiths, we no longer have the national unity we have had in war in times past.



A COUNTRY DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF
A shot from the recent anti-war meeting held by Moslems in Bradford.

MEETING OPPOSES OUR TROOPS

At a meeting of Moslem leaders in Bradford (where else!) last month a resolution was passed which called for the removal of allied troops from the Gulf Region. The resolution spoke of "this savage, destructive war being waged by the United States, Britain and their allies against the Moslems of Iraq."

Actually, the question of whether the Gulf War is a good or bad thing, whether it is right or wrong for Britain, is not the central one here.

What is central to this issue is that the growing Moslem opposition to the war is a portent of things to come. On some future occasion Britain may find herself engaged in another war, with Moslems on the other side, which it is absolutely right and necessary for us to fight. What then will be the position of Moslems in this country? If present developments are any guide, it seems that in any future situation of war the loyalty of many Moslems in Britain will be towards their fellow Moslems abroad rather then to Britain. This is a truly alarming prospect, and one for which we have to thank those politicians who over the past three or four decades have been hell-bent on turning this country into a dumping ground for foreign racial and religious groups from all over the world.

The situation just serves to provide one more example of the correctness of the stand this paper has made over the years against non-European immigration and in favour of massed repatriation of the immigrants and their descendents now here.

As we have seen, Britain's ability to survive a future war may depend on it!

The war: why we do not make common cause with the left

NO SOONER was the Gulf War started than the mobs of the left, quite predictably, were found to be out in force demonstrating for the recall of British forces. There was never any doubt that the left, led by Tony Benn, Tam Dalyell and other familiar pacifists and Britain-haters, would oppose the war.

In this case, however, we also happen to oppose the involvement of Britain in the conflict in the Gulf. But our reasons for opposition are wholly different. Also different is our response. We will not be found promoting public demonstrations against the war; nor do we believe that British forces, now that they have been committed to battle, should be withdrawn. They should be given our full support in their efforts to get the war over as quickly as possible. **Then they should be brought home.** They should not be kept in the Gulf Region as a semi-permanent occupation force, at vast expense to the British taxpayer, defending interests that are not our interests. Nor should they, if it is not possible to end the war quickly, be bled white in a long and drawn-out conflict, as were America's forces in Vietnam.

We share in common with the left the fact that we are not in agreement with the Gulf War. But there the resemblance ends.

The left opposes **any** war in which Britain is involved. Most of all, the left opposes British forces being deployed in a war that is fought in defence of vital British interests. The left, quite simply, is **anti-British**.

We believe, on the other hand, that British forces should be sent to war **only** in defence of British interests. And where such British interests are at stake we believe that **all necessary force should be used**.

When Britain was at war in the Falklands we and the left were on totally opposite sides. *British Nationalist* and the British National Party were 100 per-cent behind the war. The left was, as might be expected, opposed to it.

We were behind the war because the Falklands were — and are — British. The Argentine occupation of the Falklands was a British concern. Indeed it was something that concerned Britain and Agentina **alone**.

FORCES NEEDED IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Likewise, Northern Ireland is British. Right now there is a genuine threat to Britain's interests from her enemies in Northern Ireland: the IRA and its republican supporters. Where we need to be using massive military force is in putting down our enemies in Northern Ireland. How absurd it is that we are deploying all these forces in the Gulf while we seem to be incapable of winning the war in Northern Ireland — a war that has dragged on for more than twenty years! Where is our sense of priorities?

ALWAYS AGAINST BRITAIN
A left-wing 'anti-war' demonstration, held in London last month. The left will always be found on the opposite side to whatever cause Britain is fighting for. We, on the other hand, will always be on Britain's side — though we do not believe British forces should be sent to fight for foreign interests.

Kuwait is not British. Nor has Britain any essential interests there. The Iraqi occupation of Kuwait is not

Contd. on back page col. 1

British
Nationalist
No. 107 FEBRUARY 1991
Editor: John Morse

OURSELVES AND THE MOSLEM WORLD

OUR COUNTRY is now busy meddling in the Middle East, trying to impose the will of our politicians on an Arab state. Meanwhile, at the very same time, here in Britain itself we have a pollulating population of immigrants from the Moslem World who see no reason why they should not seek to apply the precepts of their militant and expansionist creed by imposing THEIR will on US in OUR land.

The Gulf War dramatically illustrates, as has almost nothing before it, the crazy, topsy-turvy relationship which the present-day ordering of the globe has created between the West and Islam.

The fact that one Arab chieftain, Saddam Hussein of Iraq, has taken a patch of desert sand away from another Arab chieftain, the Emir of Kuwait, cannot really matter twopence to Britain, let alone be worth the war our rulers have seen fit to unleash.

But the fact that whole areas of Britain itself are at the same time being seized and colonised by millions of Moslems is of vital concern to this country.

Yet it is to the former problem — not the latter — that our Government addresses itself, at the expense of much British treasure and maybe many British lives.

Whilst we seek to mind the Moslems' business in their part of the world rather than our own business in our part, many of them feel that they can set about dictating to us on our very own soil. Regarding the Anglo-American war on Iraq, it may be that Moslem militants in our midst, such as the anti-Rushdie campaigners of Bradford and beyond, will condescend to restrain their opposition while the shooting lasts; but it is unlikely that they will turn out to have done so without some promise of a reward from our Government, whatever this may turn out to be. Perhaps Britain's establishment will give them the blasphemy law they have been demanding to protect their religion (and themselves) from any criticism.

Meanwhile, one national daily newspaper warns us that by waging this war we will have succeeded in making "one billion enemies" (approximately the world Moslem population).

What a ludicrous situation!

There is no need for any of this. The whole problem could be solved by simple agreement between ourselves in the West and them, the Moslems: We get out of their world and refrain from trying to order their internal affairs — if they do the same for us.

Some will say that it is necessary to tinker in Arab affairs to assure the oil supplies needed by the West. This is nonsense. To begin with, there are enormous oil reserves, many still to be tapped, outside the Middle East. Secondly, even if we needed Arab oil it could not matter which Arab ruler, or what sort, we bought it from. Almost the only source of real wealth the Arabs have is their oil exports. The West is overwhelmingly their major customer. In the long run they have to sell their oil to us. Meanwhile, they and the rest of their Moslem brethren can thus be safely left to arrange their own affairs in their part of the world as they see fit — while we, free of their alien presence in our land, can be left to do likewise.

THE GULF WAR: WHERE WE STAND

British National Party leader JOHN TYNDALL answers questions on the present Gulf conflict

Could you explain the position of the British National Party on the present Gulf War?

In the weeks leading up to the outbreak of war we strongly opposed British participation in the conflict, which we believed to be an Arab affair which should be settled by Arabs and one in which Britain had no business. However, now that our Government has taken the step of committing us to war and British servicemen are engaged, or are shortly about to be engaged, in battle, it is best that victory be pursued quickly and as far as possible painlessly, with the minimum loss of British lives. Therefore nothing should be done that might harm the morale or fighting capability of our servicemen in the Gulf.

Your party claims to be most patriotic of all the parties in Britain. Do you not think that it is everyone's patriotic duty to support the war?

It depends in what context you are using the word 'patriotic'. In the very short term, our patriotic duty is to do everything we can do to ensure that Britain emerges from the conflict with honour — which means that our servicemen should fight courageously and well and that they should win the victory that they were sent out there to win — also that, as I have said, loss of life on their part is minimised. Remember that these servicemen mostly comprise the best elements of our race; they are the kind that we can least afford to lose.

In the longer term, however, patriotism must be defined as something identifiable with the defence and pursuit of **national interests**. In the fullness of time it is going to be recognised that British national interests are not served by our becoming involved in the Gulf conflict.

Do you not think it selfish and wrong that Britain should think only in terms of her own national interest? Is it not the case that Saddam Hussein is an evil man, who must be brought down in the interests of the wider international community, and that it is Britain's duty to play her part in bringing this about?

The world is full of evil men and always has been. If we regarded it our duty to go and bring them down wherever and whenever they emerged we would never know a moment's peace; our forces would be at war somewhere or other in the world in perpetuity. We have simply got to acknowledge that there are some evils around this vast globe of ours that we can do nothing about. We should concentrate on dealing with those evils that specifically affect us. Up to the time this war broke out, Saddam Hussein was not one of them. He has now been made into one by British participation in the war. This being the case, he has to be dealt with and the war brought to a quick conclusion so that our servicemen can be brought home. However, what we should most definitely not do is regard the war against Saddam as a model for the future conduct of British foreign policy. When Saddams emerge in the future, they should be left alone unless they threaten us or our vital interests.

As for your point about 'international duty', I seem to remember exactly the same phrase being used by the Soviet leaders to justify their intervention in one country after another where Russia had no business, the last such case being Afghanistan. There is no such thing as 'international duty' in my book; there is only duty to our own country and our own people.

Saddam Hussein has used armed force to invade a neighbouring country. Do you believe that we can sanction such a thing and let him get away with it?

The question of whether one 'sanctions' such things is neither here nor there. The fact is that they happen and, as I have indicated, we cannot make it our business to go and intervene every time they happen. Just look at some of the invasions that have taken place in recent times: Israel invaded Lebanon in 1982, and we didn't hear anyone suggest that either the US or Britain should intervene to throw her out. I have already mentioned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Apart from boycotting the Moscow Olympics, America did almost nothing and Britain didn't even boycott the Olympics — one of the few occasions in modern times when we didn't follow slavishly on America's tails. There was the Iraqi invasion of Iran just over a decade ago; we and the Americans simply left the Iraqis and the Iranians to fight it out — which was the correct policy. Quite recently the Americans themselves invaded Panama, and before that Grenada. Our Government made no protest in either case, despite the fact that Grenada is supposed to be a Commonwealth country. Last but not least, at the very moment that we are in the Gulf, fighting the Iraqis because they are supposedly 'invaders', the Soviets have sent their tanks into the Baltic States and are now crushing the independence movements there. Why the selective indignation over the fate of Kuwait and the call for our troops to die for that country, while we have done nothing in the face of these other invasions?

Surely there is a difference in the case of the current Gulf Crisis. Saddam Hussein, were he to be allowed to get away with the invasion of Kuwait, would control more than 40 per-cent of the world's oil supply. He would be able to hold the western world to ransom with this kind of near-monopoly. Is it not a fact that we have to intervene to protect our oil?

Ah! I notice that you have now switched the debate to another level. Previously you were arguing for US and British intervention in the Gulf on grounds of principle. Now you are doing so on grounds of necessity. Let us be clear what the issue is about: is it one of principle or is it one of necessity? If it is the latter, let's drop the protestations about 'principles' and get down to the real debate, which has nothing to do with those principles but concerns only the question of whether we should go to war for oil. At least the argument then becomes an honest one and is not clouded in hypocrisy.

Our party believes, and I personally believe, that when the necessity of national interest demands, Britain should be prepared to go to war. That is what distinguishes us straightaway from the left-wing and pacifist lobby, which today is demonstrating against the war in the Gulf for wholly different reasons. The left believes that Britain should never go to war in pursuit of the national interest; we, on the other hand, believe that Britain should go to war **only** in pursuit of the national interest. The great question is: does the national interest involved in the oil question amount to one of such magnitude that it exceeds any interests which require that we stay out? I do not believe that it does.

Of course, the ideal situation would be that countries like Britain, the US and others of the western world would control the sources of their own oil supplies and be able to ensure at all times that the oil was available to them at prices which it suited them to pay.

But we are not in this ideal situation because a very large part of the world's oil is to be found in countries that are under Arab sovereignty, not our own.

Of course, it would be possible for the countries of the West, by the use of overwhelming military force, to place themselves in such a position that they would be able to dictate to the Arabs the terms on which the oil of the Middle East was supplied to them; and the present operations in the Gulf bear all the signs of this being one of the purposes — though only one — of US and British policy.

But the essential thing to understand is that such a state of affairs can only be brought about at enormous cost — indeed a cost so great that it would far outweigh any advantage gained in the price of oil. This present war is going to cost us untold billions. Even when it is over and presumably victory over the Iraqis is won, that victory can only be sustained by a large and permanent military presence on the part of the US and her allies in the Gulf — costing yet more billions.

Then in addition to that, we have to contend with the fact that a certain legacy of the war will be a multiplication of the hostility and hatred towards the western powers on the part of the Arab world, a hostility and hatred that have already existed for a long time but which will become many times greater in the future. We will have to take into account the implications of this in the field of terrorism against western targets, and the immensely increased cost of anti-terrorist measures on our part which will then become necessary. One of the factors which we cannot ignore in this regard is that (by consent of British governments over the past two or three decades) we now have a large and burgeoning Moslem population in this country. Already there are indications that a great many of these people are strongly opposed to what Britain is now doing in the Gulf.

And there is a further consideration. Whilst the allied forces now in the Gulf may well have the military capability to win the main part of the war before too long, can they be sure of their ability to wipe out completely the forces arrayed against them? The battleground over which the present war is being fought is a large one; potentially it is larger still, encompassing a vast area of the Middle Eastern region. 'Mopping up' operations, disposing of the whole of the anti-western forces — including guerilla formations — could take years, even decades. Even if it is possible for us to 'get Saddam', he will have his successors and imitators. We could be building up for ourselves a bleeding wound which might claim British lives, and cost vast amounts of British money, for another generation or more. The Americans have to face exactly the same problem.

Where the oil supply is concerned, on the other hand, there is a limit to how much its price can be jacked up to suit the Arabs who control it. Not even these people can overturn basic economic laws. The Arabs owning the oil can only sell it to the outside world at the price the latter is able and willing to pay for it. The oil in the region is an important part of the world's supply, but it is not the only part. Apart from other sources already in operation, there are further reserves of almost infinite quantity which, though not economic at present price levels, would become so beyond a certain point of increase in the price of Middle Eastern oil. These can be found in Canada, Alaska and Russia. In addition to this, there is the oil-from-coal process which played a large part in sustaining the German war machine in 1939-45. Furthermore, there are energy substitutes for oil which already exist and are certain to be developed much further in the future. No, there is a limit to how far the likes of Saddam Hussein, or any of his successors,

Contd. on page 7

UNFURLING THE FLAG

British Desert Rats in the Gulf prepare to hoist the national colours over their armoured vehicles. Short-term patriotic considerations demand that we back our servicemen in bringing the war to a quick conclusion; long-term ones require that in future we stay out of Middle Eastern quarrels

Bribery, corruption and deceit grease Gulf War build-up

NOT THE LEAST of the factors oiling the wheels of the international military build-up against Iraq is outright bribery and corruption on a gigantic scale. This, rather than the idealistic-sounding motives pro-claimed by western politicians, is at the root of the United Nations vote for war.

Quite a few of the participants seem to have had their palms greased with big money as an inducement to give the go-ahead for war with their votes at the UN. The American taxpayer, the biggest milch-cow for aid to the Third World and to Israel, has been one of the major payers of the bill.

One of the front-liners for this largesse, it has been recently revealed, was President Assad of Syria. The US is said to have bribed him personally with a sum of no less than $800 million.

Also on the gravy train is Egyptian leader Hosni Mubarak. Since 1978, when his predecessor President Sadat did a 'peace' deal with Israel's Menachem Begin in exchange for dollar aid, constantly poverty-striken Egypt has been given sums which have been kept in constant proportion to the ever-increasing billions given to the Zionist bandit state itself.

Not that this helped Sadat very much. His part in the deal was looked at by many of his fellow Arabs as treason to the anti-Israeli cause, and shortly afterwards he was assassinated. Nor did it help Egypt much either. As desperately poor as ever, the country was bribed to line up with the US-led front against Iraq in the present crisis by means of a $7 billion 'forgiveness' of outstanding debts owing to the US.

REALITIES BEHIND KUWAIT

Other equally grubby realities lurk behind the simulated concern for the alleged 'sufferings' of Kuwait under Iraqi rule. All sorts of Kings, Emirs and Sheikhs were elevated to thrones in the oil-rich Gulf states after the First World War. In that war those territories had been detached from Turkish rule, and one of the most artificial of these was Kuwait, which was separated from Iraq by the victorious western powers.

Kuwait's oil wealth is stupendous. The cosmopolitan international money-men behind the major oil companies who wished to exploit it for their own profit knew that this would be much easier if the territory was turned into a tiny artificial state with a ruler who would be beholden to them for his position. In addition, it would be a simple matter to keep such a figure in line by allowing him and his extended family and hangers-on a privileged place on the oil-revenue gravy train.

Hence the enormous wealth of the Al-Sabahs, the ruling family of the Emirs of Kuwait — now aggrieved because Iraq has taken back from them what it regards as something originally stolen from itself.

Gulf oil wealth has further led to the region being developed as a centre for international finance. In Bahrain money brokers and merchant banks now abound, and international money-men can stash tax-free billions in offshore banking units.

The Al-Sabahs' wealth, estimated at about $35-40 billion, is meanwhile invested right the way round the world, some $23-28 billion of this in Britain. At least $1 billion a month has, up to now, been funnelled through the City of London.

None of this really profits Britain; it merely serves to boost the foreign control of her economy, giving a few City spivs a fast buck in the process.

Meanwhile, the wealth and status accorded to the oil-sheikhs also serve to buy them for Israel. None lend any very great support to the struggle against the Zionist gangster-state by their fellow Arabs.

REASON FOR KUWAIT INVASION

As for the invasion of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein, this was precipitated by the fact that its Emir was raising his own production of oil and thus reducing the oil prices on international markets. This did not benefit western consumers; western governments have constantly hiked taxes on petrol, whilst companies have raised pump prices to keep up their profits. The reduction did, however, directly hurt Iraq, whose economy was already in a bad state after a decade of war against Iran. It is not known whether the Emir of Kuwait was in any way being bribed to do this.

At all events, it now seems that Saddam was practically inveigled into occupying Kuwait. This was brought about partly by the Emir's oil-price shenanigans; but, in addition, it is a fact that only two days before the August 2nd Iraqi invasion a White House spokeswoman Margaret Tutweiler publicly gave Saddam to understand that the US had no commitment to defend Kuwait.

By such means was a pretext fabricated for the US to take on Israel's enemy number-one in the Middle East and destroy it without the Israelis having to lift a finger. As usual, the US has Britain in tow as her tame poodle. Mrs. Thatcher took the lead in making sure of this, but her successor Mr. Major has made it clear that he does not mean to change this subservient relationship.

Meanwhile, peace could in fact be achieved very easily. Saddam Hussein has agreed to pull out of Kuwait if Israel gives up the lands it has seized by force from Egypt (Gaza Strip), Jordan (the West Bank) and Syria (the Golan Heights).

SADDAM HUSSEIN
He has volunteered to quit Kuwait if Israel would quit her occupied territories but this has been refused.

FROM THE AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE...

PAT BUCHANAN, a leading US columnist, explains why his country should not be in the Gulf

"THERE is a strain of isolationist sentiment in our party," Vice President Dan Quayle confided to David Broder of the *Washington Post*: "The McGovern-Buchanan axis is there."

"We have to deal with it," Quayle ruminated," just as the Democrats have to deal with their isolationists...It is still a very small but vocal minority, but we have got to be sure that it does not get out of control...It is something that concerns me, because it has at times a kind of populist demogoguery to it."

"Populist demagoguery?" To raise questions about the launching of an undeclared war, against a country halfway round the world, to rescue a corpse called Kuwait?

"Isolationist" is a term intended to dismiss a man and arguments without answering them. But what is it that those of us now so branded are saying that troubled the peaceful slumber of our Vice President?

We are saying that it's time that Free Europe, with more people and as much wealth as America, bore the burden of its own defence; time that mighty Japan, with its vast trade surpluses, did likewise. And time that the $100 billion saved annually (by bringing the boys home) be ploughed into TAX CUTS to invigorate US industry, to recapture markets our allies took away from us while we defended them.

We must think anew and act anew, says Mr. Bush. He is right. Yet historians will read in astonishment how, with his nation $3 trillion in debt and running a $300 billion deficit, Mr. Bush continued to send our seed corn abroad in foreign aid to deadbeat regimes, not one of which had dropped off Uncle Sam's welfare roll in 20 years.

We should walk, not run, to the exits, Admiral William Crowe has said. Sound advice. We need, carefully, to pull up those 'trip-wires' put down during the Cold War to ensnare us in conflicts. We need to take a hard look at 40-year-old treaties with 40-odd nations whose defence is no longer tied, even remotely, to US national security.

Most of us 'neo-isolationists' — a disparate, contentious lot — are not really 'neo' anything. We are Old Church and Old Right, anti-imperialist and anti-interventionist, disbelievers in a *Pax Americana*. We love the Old Republic, and, where we hear phrases like New World Order, we release the safety-catch on our revolvers. On the Gulf, we disagree.

WHAT ARE WE DEFENDING?

Some ask: WHAT ARE WE DEFENDING in Saudi Arabia? The oil wells of ARAMCO? A monarchy that will not admit crosses to be worn openly by US combat troops who are supposed to die defending the sacred throne of His Highness King Fahd? What?

In this writer's view, Mr. Bush was right to warn Saddam Hussein that, if he attacked Saudi Arabia, he would face the United States. He did the right thing drawing the "line in the sand." He did the right thing organising the embargo.

Where he went overboard was with apocalyptic rhetoric. He declared our "way of life" at risk; he equated a sandbox despot with Adolf Hitler; he raged: "This I will not stand!" when it was still unclear what vital interest of ours required forcing an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. In ordering half a million troops to the Gulf, when a Reaganite warning could have stopped Saddam at the Saudi-Kuwait frontier, Mr. Bush has taken us to the brink of war (*This article was written before war broke out. Ed.*).



BUSH
Went overboard, says writer

But Kuwait is not worth a war. Is it 'isolationist' to say so? To argue that the 82nd Airborne ought not to have to die to restore to its throne a Sabbah royal family whose own soldiers ran away rather than fight for it?

"Brutal, naked aggression," the President says. True, but so was Indonesia's rape of East Timor, China's move into Tibet, Moscow's lunge into Afghanistan. To call an invasion "brutal, naked aggression" does not tell us why it is OUR war to fight.

BLOOD AND IRON

The world's frontiers were not written on tablets of stone in the Garden of Eden. They were written by blood and iron in our own time. The map of Europe was drawn up by the cynical victors of Versailles, when the Ottoman Empire went under the carving knife.

All these frontiers are products of war, imperialism, injustice. They are going to be rearranged one day by men, good and bad, who will find them intolerable. Why should Americans die to defend such frontiers, when our own security is not in jeopardy?

In this decade, we would see the break-up of Canada, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, India — perhaps even Britain. Nationalism and tribalism are ascendant. A dozen wars could erupt over lost provinces in Europe, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Rather than send our fighting men overseas to intervene in these wars, why not bring them home, and watch, in peace, as men do what they have done since time began? Isn't that what the Founding Fathers said America was all about?

Let others play the game of global empire. In Jeanne Kirkpatrick's phrase, let America become again a "normal country in a normal time."

Pat Buchanan is a nationally syndicated columnist in the United States and is seen frequently on American television. This article was brought to our attention by being published in THE POPULIST OBSERVER, obtainable from PO Box 1989, Ford City, Pa. 16226, U.S.A.

Time to break free

In the Gulf War, as in everything else, Britain serves as America's lackey. When are we going to put an end to this degrading subservience?

PRIME MINISTER John Major was reported as saying last month that if the other European nations, particularly Germany and Italy, did not make a greater contribution to supporting America in the Gulf War the Americans would punish them by withdrawing their protection from Europe.

This was just one more of the abject postures of grovelling subservience to America that British leaders, particularly Tory ones, have been making for years. The whole of the Gulf War is a further demonstration of this subservience. Britain has been dragged into the war on the coat-tails of the United States. She has placed her forces in the Gulf under American command — although the French, to their credit, have refused to do likewise. British politicians and journalists behave like little dogs wagging their tails whenever a crumb of praise comes from US leaders or military commanders for the British forces in the Gulf.

We do not believe that this is the way for a self-respecting nation to behave.

As for the threat that the Americans might withdraw their protection from Europe, we are entitled to ask: protection against what? The spectre of a Soviet military menace — always more apparent than real — is now no longer remotely credible. And even supposing such a menace did exist, are we to suppose that 300-plus million Europeans, with technologies far more advanced than that of the Soviets, are incapable of dealing with it? The idea is ludicrous.

Over 200 years ago America made its declaration of independence from Britain. We think it is high time for us British to make our declaration of independence from America.

There is nothing to stop us remaining on friendly terms with the ordinary American people. After all, a very large portion of them still are of British descent.

But friendship does not have to mean vassalhood. In fact no two people can be proper friends when one is the lackey of the other.

Why can British politicians not learn this?

Groveller Major, as the *Today* cartoonist recently depicted him

AS GOVERNMENT SPENDS BILLIONS ON GULF WAR...

Britain slides to ruin

BRITAIN is being run by incompentents and lunatics — we have been saying this for years; now it is being proved by recent events.

The Government has committed us to a war in the Middle East, in a quarrel between two groups of Arab states that is none of our business, which is now costing the nation £4½ million a day. This cost is certain to escalate upwards as the war intensifies and more and more of our forces become involved. And the sum quoted refers only to direct military expenditure; it does not cover all the indirect costs that are bound to occur.

One such cost is going to be the appalling strain on our health services. Already, hospitals are being prepared to accommodate casualties as they are flown home from the Gulf. The bed space will be taken up at the expense of civilians badly needing hospital treatment. If the war was being fought for British national survival or in some essential British interest, we would have to accept such things; but, as stated elsewhere in this issue, this simply is not the case.

The conduct of the war is obviously going to occupy a great deal of the time and attention of the Prime Minister and his Government ministers over the next few months — possibly even years. That will be time and attention not given to Britain's internal affairs and problems — and just at a moment when we sink ever deeper into national crisis, with the nation in terrible trouble on many fronts.

Unemployment, after a brief respite in the late-1980s, is soaring up again, with the City — traditionally an ally of the Tory Government — acknowledging a likely increase of 1½ million in the next 18 months. Manufacturing output is sharply down, and the much-vaunted 'service industries' of the Thatcher era are nosediving as the recession deepens.

BANKRUPTCIES RECORD

Figures recently released show a rapid drop in investment. Business bankruptcies are at their highest rate ever. The high interest-rates which have caused so many firms to go bust and so many families to lose their homes will stay because of the Government's commitment to the EEC and the exchange-rate mechanism, which John Major as Chancellor was mainly instrumental in getting us into.

Now, on top of all this, there is bound to be an increase in taxation to help the Government pay for its insane war. This is going to hit industry, just as it is going to hit the consumer.

In the meantime, the Government is totally failing to house the nation properly. In the field of education it inherited a shambles from Labour and has succeeded only in turning this into an even bigger shambles. Its record on law and order is lamentable, with crime figures going through the roof (see our article on page 5). And, despite the former Tory Premier's promises to the contrary, made when she was fighting the 1979 general election, Britain continues to be overrun with immigrants from the Third World — with the huge Moslem presence now presenting even bigger difficulties than before, as we find a large part of the Islamic population supporting the country we are now fighting.

THE ULSTER WAR

Last but not least, Britain has a war on her own doorstep which, unlike the one in the Middle East, is very much her business. This is the war in Northern Ireland waged against us by the terrorists of the IRA. Instead of deploying our armed forces against Saddam Hussein in the Gulf, we should be concentrating them back here at home in an all-out assault on the IRA and its allies, so as to bring that long, drawn-out conflict to a victorious conclusion once and for all.

THE REAL PRIORITIES

In the face of mounting chaos at home, what Britain's Government ought to be doing is applying itself single-mindedly to domestic problems, and devoting all available economic resources to the solutions to those problems.

The fact that in this perilous domestic situation Major & Co. can find time and money to involve the nation in overseas adventures where no British interests are at stake simply indicates that lunacy has taken over in Downing Street and Whitehall even more totally than before.

We in the BNP are in no doubt about what should be done in such a situation. We should quit the Gulf and leave the Kuwait question for the Arabs to sort out amongst themselves. And we should commit all the resources of Britain to rescuing Britain from the abyss.

THE REAL ENEMY
Masked and uniformed IRA thugs, seen here at a funeral of one of their fellow murderers. While our armed services are wasted in the Middle East, they continue to kill and maim British citizens. We should bring our Gulf forces home and let them wipe out these scum once and for all.

Thousands facing dole

THOUSANDS could lose their jobs over the next few months as the recession deepens, employers warned yesterday.

More than half the firms questioned for the Confederation of British Industry's latest industrial trends survey said they expected to cut their workforces soon.

That suggests unemployment — currently 1.84million — will accelerate over the next four months, leading to

Firms ready to axe more jobs as recession bites deeper

THE PAINFUL TRUTH
While Major & Co. play warlords in the Middle East, the state of the British economy goes from bad to worse. This headline is taken from the* Daily Mail *of January 30th. The* Mail, *a pro-Tory paper, is not likely to be accused of bias against the Government.

Why depend on Belgian ammo?

NO SOONER had Britain become involved in the Gulf War than there were some very red faces in Whitehall. Apparently, our troops have been depending on ammunition manufactured in Belgium to keep their guns firing. The Belgians are somewhat less enamoured of the war than is our Government, and they refused to allow the ammo to be supplied to us.

This resulted in some very angry swipes at the Belgians, typical of which was a leader in the *Sunday Express* of January 6th, which spoke of their "base act of betrayal."

In fact the *SE* should be directing its annoyance, not at Belgium, but at the fools in our own Government who allowed us to become dependent on her in the first place.

WAR IS BAD FOR BRITAIN BUT COULD BE GOOD FOR GOVERNMENT

ONCE AGAIN, military conflict is rescuing a wobbly Tory Government. Since the shooting war started in the Gulf, a 5-point opinion-poll lead for Labour has turned into a 4-point lead for the Conservatives.

Exactly the same happened as a result of the Falklands War in 1982, and this helped the Tories win the general election the following year.

Despite economic recession and the hated poll tax, Major & Co. could well win the next general election — not on their own achieve-ments but once again on the backs of our courageous armed forces.



Major — saved by the war?



ROTTING SLUMS OF BRITAIN
The Government's housing record is abysmal. While it can raise billions to send British servicemen abroad to fight Arab quarrels, it cannot find the money to provide decent homes for its own people.

AS THE GULF WAR GETS UNDER WAY WE ASK...

Have we a fifth column in Britain?

IN THE GULF British service personnel are fighting and dying in a bloody war. In Britain, meanwhile, British people themselves are being forbidden by their employers to exhibit their own national flag in their own workplaces to show their support for their own kinfolk, friends and fellow-countrymen in the forces out in the Middle East.

Why?

Because it is being said that for British people in their own land to show solidarity with their nation's fighting men might 'offend' Moslems in their workplaces whose natural sympathies are thought to lie with Iraq — the country that we suddenly find ourselves being called on to fight.

Thus at Lucas Aerospace, Hemel Hempstead, which makes electronics for Tornado aircraft currently in use against Iraq, Union Jacks were torn down by managers. Likewise at a Woking firm which manufactures for the Ministry of Defence. The personnel manager at this firm said: "We don't want to upset our ethnic workers."

As yet another example, security guards employed by Birmingham City Council were told to take down their flags in case they "insulted Moslems."

ONE THEY DIDN'T STOP
Dust cart man David Mobsby, seen here flying the flag on his vehicle in Camden, North London

In Stockton, Cleveland, taxi drivers have been told to remove Union Jack stickers from their windows. The Chairman of the Council's licencing committee, one Barry Woodhouse, said that the emblems could inflame Moslem cabbies and lead to punch-ups.

In Islington, North London, Council transport manager David Taylor ordered a driver to remove a Union Flag from a dustcart after two residents (immigrants?) complained that it was being used "for political purposes."

Our media and politicians have gone out of their way to drum up no end of jingo patriotism over the war against Iraq in a way they have not seen fit to do in any other recent cause. They have also invested vast sums of the nation's dwindling wealth in financing that war.

And yet we now find that all over the country ordinary Britons are being prevented from identifying themselves and showing solidarity with their armed forces in the manner that is natural in any war situation.

Could you imagine what people would have said in World War II if they had been ordered not to fly the national flag in case it might give offence to Nazi supporters in Britain?

The question has to be asked: do we now have a fifth column operating in this country? Or is this just another symptom of how crazy Britain has become?

Getting to the real core of the matter

Peregrine Worsthorne's occupation of the moral heights in the Gulf was, understandably, short-lived. Not many would have believed that such a mighty panoply was deployed solely to restore some hedonistic Emirs known for their quality harems and obese bank accounts.

His new cause, oil, will also fail to rally the troops. Not because the British are particularly altruistic, but because this is so obviously untrue. A prolonged war will turn the market's current recession into a catatonic depression.

We are in the Gulf to guarantee Israel's survival. If politicians and the press were honest enough to say so they would have the full support of the British people and the currently reluctant Europeans.

Lastly, Israel's participation in the war, which will soon follow, will accelerate its successful conclusion. Dr. K. MANIS.

(Letter in *Sunday Telegraph*, 3.2.91)

Third World 'refugee' madness: the chickens come home to roost

THOSE whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad. So said the ancient Romans.

Way back in 1951 our Government committed Britain to a rare piece of madness. This was the United Nations Convention on Refugees. Filled out by legislation passed at Westminster, this now amounts to a blank cheque given by Britain to all the wretched of the 'Third World' to descend on our territory and claim asylum here — if only they can get us to believe that they are victims of 'persecution' back where they came from.

The Halkevi Centre in Stoke Newington — scene of clashes between Turks and the police

In practice it has proved difficult, if not impossible, for our immigration authorities to establish who, among the swarms of Third Worlders pitching up at Heathrow with hard luck stories, are genuine political refugees and who are merely landing here for a meal ticket the likes of which their homelands have proved incapable of supplying.

Thus recent claimants to Britain's hospitality as "seekers after political asylum" have come from as far afield

Contd. on page 8

YOUR LETTERS

Sir, — At present I work on a building site in Blackburn for a company which, for obvious reasons, I shall not name. At the moment twelve of the houses we have built are starting to be handed over to Blackburn Council, and thence on to the tenants (97 per-cent of whom are immigrants).

As I spend much of my time in the site office, I come into contact with many of the officials who are involved with council tenants. A recent telephone call I overheard was between two housing officers.

The case being discussed was that of a British white man who resented the fact that his front door faced that of an Asian Moslem. He had asked if he could be moved to a house at the end of the terrace. The answer was a straight No! Arrangements for the allocations of houses had already been made and could not be changed.

But then an Indian had also asked to be moved to the end of the terrace because of religious arguments with the Moslem. This time the answer was Yes!

Is this not a case of discrimination against Whites?

M. WILBY
Cheadle Hulme, Ches.

Sir, — Since the legalising of abortion in 1967 — the result of a bill sponsored by 'Sir' David Steel — some two million pregnancies have been terminated in this country.

In 1989 alone, some 219,000 babies were aborted in Britain — a rate of 600 per day!

The pro-abortion lobby usually comes out with the excuse that a woman must have control over her own body.

To this, there is a simple reply: It is morally wrong to kill what would have been perfectly healthy children.

In short, as the BNP sticker says, abortion is child-murder.

A. LIGHTFOOT
Bridlington, Yorks.

CRIME GETTING COMPLETELY OUT OF HAND

While violent assaults break all records, officialdom and media try to cover up race factor

ALMOST exactly two years ago this paper described how Britain was showing signs of running out of control, as violent lawlessness took over our streets. Today nothing has changed — except perhaps for the deepening cover-up of some of the keys facts of the situation both at official level and in the media. In reality, crime is now at record levels.

Figures released just before Christmas showed the rate of criminality at what one paper (the *Daily Mail*, December 20th) described as a "new high" with 12,000 crimes a day. The latest figures represent the second highest quarterly increase since records began 133 years ago — up 16 per-cent compared to the same period a year previously.

Concerning the media cover-up, just over a year ago the editors of Britain's major national daily and Sunday newspapers took it upon themselves to declare in a public statement that the racial identity of of violent criminals was "irrelevant," with the implication that if those criminals were non-white that detail would be deliberately excluded from reports (as has by and large been done).

But facts are facts and truth will out. For a start, despite the pre-*glasnost* Soviet-style censorship, ordinary Britons in large numbers are now falling victims to the exploding mayhem. What is more, the general pattern comes out clearly from any survey of local newspapers from up and down Britain.

The *Manchester Evening News* reported in November on the trial of two savage thugs who committed hideous atrocities in the course of a robbery. Chinadu Iheagwara, described as a 22-year-old A-level student, and his 26-year-old accomplice Steve Julien deliberately crippled for life a couple of security guards whose van they were trying to rob outside the Coin Controls Company in Oldham, Lancs.



IHEAGWARA
Used machete to hack off security man's lower leg

When the middle-aged guards failed to hand over cash, Iheagwara hacked off the lower leg of one of them, Mr. William Banham, with a machete. Manchester Crown Court heard that Iheagwara did this simply to show off his 'ruthlessness'.

When Mr. Banham's colleague, Mr. Hayden Hooper, tried to run, shotgun-toting Julien blasted him in the back. Julien then turned round and repeatedly shot Mr. Banham in the leg, blowing off his ankle as he lay helpless on the ground.

After the raid, swaggering Julien escaped to Trinidad, his parents' homeland. He was only extradited to face trial in Britain because he chanced to break the local law by using a false identity to apply for naturalisation. Arrested while casually sunbathing on a beach in the Caribbean island, Julian was returned to the UK still wearing his multi-coloured summer shorts.

He and Iheagwara, both members of a notorious gang from Manchester's Cheetham Hill area, were sentenced between them to a total of 42 years' jail. Passing sentence, Judge Rhys Davies told them: "Your conduct was of the most brutal, violent, callous nature."

VICIOUS ATTACKS

A similar description could be given to the stabbing, also in November, of a 14-year-old schoolgirl on Plumstead Common, S.E. London. This was allowed to get no further than an inside page of the local *Kentish Times*.

The girl was accosted by a knife-wielding thug who seized her and frisked her, forcing her to hand over £3. Not content with that, the thug plunged his knife into the girl's back and chest, just missing her heart, before running off. She was taken to hospital, where she spent days fighting for her life. Police were reported in the paper to be looking for "an 18-20-year-old, 5ft 8in tall black youth."

Earlier this year, lonely 52-year-old widow Doreen Vaux was murdered in her flat in the notorious Dalston neighbourhood of East London. She had nothing of value to offer the raider who broke in except her treasured engagement ring. After taking this, he casually stabbed her to death.

Mrs. Vaux's killer's description is not known, but the district itself is infamous not only for its high rates of crime — including muggings, rapes, drug-linked offences and murders, of which there were several last year — but also for its atmosphere of racial tension.

No doubt, these incidents — just a cross-section of recent mayhem of the same kind — will be entered up in crime statistics simply as violent robberies. Nevertheless, the violence involved in them went far beyond what any mere thief would think necessary to his purposes. Certainly, in years gone by it was exceedingly unusual for robberies to be aggravated in this way.

ASSAULTS ON POLICE

Perhaps one thing above all shows the brutal and arrogant contempt that the newer type of inner-city criminal has towards British society and British people. This is the frequency of violent assaults, especially in Britain's multi-racial towns and cities, upon police.

One of the bloodiest in a whole series of these was the murder, In Hackney, E. London, of P.C. Lawrence Brown. P.C. Brown and two colleagues were answering a call in the Haggerston area of the borough just following August Bank Holiday last year. Brown had gone off on his own to search for a suspect who had been said to have been interfering with parked cars.



BRUTALLY GUNNED DOWN
Murdered PC Lawrence Brown, seen here shortly before his death with his wife and four-month-old daughter Emma

The 27-year-old constable was blasted in the chest at point-blank range after he came face-to-face with a thug armed with a sawn-off shotgun. An elderly lady who witnessed the killing said: "I saw the poor boy die. He never stood a chance." An unemployed 20-year-old man, Mark Gaynor, of no fixed abode, was later arrested. He appeared in court in jeans and a multi-coloured T-shirt.

Some two weeks later, another London bobby was set upon in one of the capital's "racially sensitive" neighbourhoods. P.C. Gary Brett and a colleague were arresting two suspects in North West London's Stonebridge Park Estate, notorious for its drug-pushers, when they were attacked by a mob of 35 youths. After being hit with a brick, P.C. Brett was carried into a block of flats by the gang. It can only be guessed what kinds of acts the jeering youths had it in mind to commit against their captive. Fortunately, the latter was rescued by police reinforcements in the nick of time.

JULIEN
Blasted other security man with shotgun

When Britain's police can come under attack as is happening today, no Briton can any longer regard him- or herself as safe. Meanwhile, it is clear that nothing meaningful will be done to put an end to this appalling state of affairs until the veil of lies and suppressions of the truth used to conceal it from the public is torn away. This must be done if Britain's traditional national community is ever to be restored.

Mr. Major shows his colours

NEW PREMIER John Major is losing no time identifying himself firmly with the multi-racial society to which he and his Government are committed. Shortly after his loud public condemnation of the Cheltenham Tories who objected to a black parliamentary candidate being foisted on them (no doubt largely at his bidding), he appeared in public accompanied by a black bodyguard. A report in The Sun *said that the guard cannot be named but "his appointment echoes Mr. Major's vision of a classless Britain, free of discrimination."*

Major has in fact gone flat out from the very beginning of his political career to ingratiate himself with Britain's ethnic minorities. When a councillor in Lambeth in the late 1960s he played a leading part in hounding supporters of Enoch Powell out of the local Tory Party. For this he won the praise and admiration of no less an eminence than extreme-left one-time GLC leader and present Labour MP Ken Livingstone. Some recommendation for a Tory Prime Minister!

The Premier with black bodyguard (right)

SPREADING THE WORD

Items available from the BNP Bookshop

154 Upper Wickham Lane
Welling
Kent DA16 3DP
Telephone: 081 316 4721

Open Tuesdays to Fridays, 10 a.m. to 5.30 p.m.

VIDEO & SOUND RECORDINGS

RALLY '90

Video-recording of the British National Party Annual Rally, October 13th 1990

Hear:-
DAVID BRUCE (Chairman)
STEVE CARTWRIGHT
JOHN PEACOCK
KARL PHILIPP
TONY WELLS
STEVE SMITH
RICHARD EDMONDS
JOHN TYNDALL

BNP Recordings, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW

RALLY '90: Video-recording of the great BNP rally in London on October 13th last year. £16 plus £1.05 p&p.

RALLY '82: Sound recording of the BNP rally in London on October 16th 1982. Speeches by John Tyndall and Charles Parker.

TYNDALL SPEAKS II: Sound recording of two studio talks by John Tyndall: (1) 'The case for nationalism'; (2) 'Tragedy of the 20th Century' (about World War II).

TYNDALL SPEAKS III: Sound recording of two studio talks by John Tyndall: (1) 'Why we must repatriate'; (2) 'Foundations of the national community'.

Sound recordings £3.50 plus 32p p&p





BOOKS



THE ELEVENTH HOUR **(by John Tyndall). Written when the BNP leader was in prison on the charge of publishing material likely to stir up 'race hatred', this book is the one all nationalists have been waiting for. The book is in two parts. The first part describes the author's early years and introduction to, and progress through, the nationalist movement. Following this is the most comprehensive presentation yet to appear of the case for British Nationalism. 609 pages. Paperback £10 plus £2 p&p. Hardback £15 plus £2.62 p&p.**



THE NAMELESS WAR **(by Capt. A.H.M. Ramsey). A British member of parliament describes the secret history leading up to the Second World War. Despite being an MP, Capt. Ramsey was jailed without trial for four years for opposing Churchill's war policy. 128 pages. £3.25 plus 46p p&p.**

NEW STICKERS

Oblong self-adhesive sticker with slogan: 'Stop immigration! Start repatriation!' in red on white background. For 80 stickers £1 plus 27p p&p. For 500 stickers £6 plus 55p p&p. For 1,000 stickers £12 plus £1.05 p&p.

Circular self-adhesive sticker in red, white and blue with BNP logo and name and address. Prices same as for immigration sticker (above).

NEW POSTER



Large three-colour poster: 17.7in x 24.85in. 1-9 copies 30p each; 10-19 copies 26p each; 20-49 copies 20p each; 50 copies or over 15p each.

B.N.P. STICKERS



OUTLAW HOMOSEXUALITY!

Protect our women and old folk STAMP OUT MUGGERS!

Fight subversion SMASH COMMUNISM!

LOVE THE WHITE RACE Protect its future!

Save our cities from this (riot)... START REPATRIATION!

As more unemployment rolls off the boats, we say... BAN IMPORTS!

Protect our young from child murderers... BRING BACK THE ROPE!

Stickers measure 3½in x 2½in. Self-adhesive at £1.50 per 100; gummed back at 40p per 100. Postage costs 26p per 100.

Scrap the Anglo-Irish Agreement KEEP ULSTER BRITISH!

ABORTION IS CHILD MURDER Make it illegal!


Free speech is under attack —
DEFEND IT!
The Government is trying to suppress criticism of its open-door immigration policy by prosecuting those who speak out. Help us fight this tyranny! Give us your support.
BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY
BNP

Free speech is under attack — DEFEND IT! Mentions prosecutions and bans against nationalists



Support Ulster Smash terrorism HANG I.R.A. MURDERERS!

Oppose the disarmers Build up our forces MAKE BRITAIN STRONG

Hong Kong Chinese NO ROOM HERE!

She freezes in Winter while Third World gets £1,000 million a year
PUT BRITISH PEOPLE BEFORE ALIENS!
BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY
BNP

She freezes in Winter while Third World gets £1,000 million a year PUT BRITISH PEOPLE BEFORE ALIENS!

Nationalist group merges with BNP

THIS MONTH we are very pleased to welcome some new colleagues in the struggle. A previously independent political group, the National Party, has agreed to close down its separate operations and merge forces with the British National Party.

On Thursday, January 10th, officials of the East Midlands BNP held talks with the leader of the Nottingham-based National Party, Mr. Lawrence Johnson, following the proposal that the NP amalgamate with the larger BNP.

Mr. Johnson founded the NP in 1989 (at about the same time as the BNP established itself in Nottingham). He has now contacted his members and supporters with a view to advising them to join the BNP.

This is certainly a most encouarging development, and a positive move towards the objective for which the BNP was originally founded: nationalist unity.

With regard to the existence of two groups running parallel campaigns, Mr. Johnson said: ''It seems sensible for our members to merge with the BNP...''

Though not a large organisation nationwide, the National Party will add substantially to the strength of the BNP in Nottingham, which is now becoming a major growth area. With the NP, Mr. Johnson also ran a most interesting and well-produced nationalist newsletter called *National News*, which it is hoped he will continue as a local organ of the BNP.

Mr. Johnson is to be praised for his sensible and unselfish move in merging his group with the BNP in the cause of unity. His decision is an excellent example to others.

NATIONAL NEWS

May 1990

UNEMPLOYMENT IS RISING

RIGHT STUFF FOR USA

HERE'S THE GOOD NEWS

A WELCOME NEW ALLY

This is a sample copy of* National News, *published by Mr. Lawrence Johnson, formerly of the National Party, now of the BNP. It is hoped that this newsletter will now serve as a BNP organ in the East Midlands.

Get the BNP in the 'phone book!

BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY headquarters is reporting excellent results from the newly adopted party policy of encouraging local BNP units to get the party's Welling bookshop address and telephone number entered in local telephone directories up and down the country. Many people have contacted the party as a result of recent media publicity, finding out its address and 'phone number by looking in their local book.

Party units which have not yet undertaken this should do so as soon as possible. If they send the money to cover the necessary charge to head office, the latter will attend to all the arrangements.

Important! The charge for this service is £12 per year, and not £28 per year, as erroneously stated in a recent report in *Spearhead* magazine.

Quite apart from the obvious advantages of this operation, there can be unexpected spin-offs. In some areas the appearance of the party in the local 'phone book has profoundly upset the opposition, as two sample letters reprinted here testify.

BT shock

I WOULD like to condemn the British National Party and British Telecom.

I have just received the new Redbridge and Chigwell telephone directory and am shocked to find the BNP listed.

Why is BT allowing the racist BNP space in our phone book?

NAME AND ADDRESS SUPPLIED

HORROR!

These two irate letters appeared in local papers in the Redbridge area following the appearance of the BNP in the directory.

Out of order

I WISH to register a complaint concerning the British National Party.

I recently received a copy of the Redbridge and Chigwell telephone directory, and was shocked to find that the BNP is listed alongside respectable organisations.

How can a racist group like the BNP be allowed to feature in our local directory when it is based in Kent? — NAME & ADDRESS SUPPLIED.

Have you paid your BNP sub for 1991? Remember that all members' subs are due for renewal on the 1st January!

SUPPORT MARATHON MAN!

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY has entered its first runner into the London Marathon to be officially sponsored by the party.

Keen fitness fan Mark Twiddy, from East London, is already running 16 miles in training sessions and is clearly a good prospect to finish the course with a reasonable time.

All readers are asked to sponsor Mark for as much as they can afford. All proceeds will go towards the fund due to be set up to finance the BNP campaign for the next general election.

Whether the sponsorships are for £1 per mile (the Marathon course is 26 miles) or £20, £15 or £10 for Mark to finish the course, all monies will be gratefully received.

Mark is flying the flag for the BNP and running the Marathon in the cause of Britain. Send all donations/sponsorships to 'BNP Marathon', PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.



MARK TWIDDY
Ready to run his legs off for the BNP

NEW UNIT IN NORTH EAST ENGLAND

JANUARY 1991 has seen a bright new start to the year by the BNP in the North East, with two meetings taking place in the Tyneside area and a new group formed and getting active in Chester-le-Street, Co. Durham.

Since the formation of the group last month, 2,000 leaflets have gone out in the town centre, and now the group is to switch to leafletting schools to alert pupils to the anti-British propaganda being spewed out by left-wing teachers.

The group has already made press publicity with a report in the* Northern Echo *(see right).

The Northern Echo, Friday, January 18, 1991

School target

THE British National Party is planning to leaflet schools in a bid to boost membership of its new branch.

The BNP recently set up a group in Chester-le-Street which has up to 20 members, mostly young people, Tyneside organiser Bill Owen said.

Now it hopes to spread its message by handing leaflets to pupils outside the gates of the town's two comprehensives.

Mr Owen said the main thrust of the campaign was against the possible immigration of people from Hong Kong.

"We'll be standing at the school gates to combat any propaganda the kids get inside about the Common Market and race relations," he said.

The plan was criticised by a Durham County Council spokesman who said: "Schools are not an appropriate venue for recruitment drives by any political party and this sort of activity would not be acceptable."

Contact your local party unit

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY is organised into active units extending over most of the areas of the United Kingdom. Below we give a list of the main units:-

NORTH WEST LONDON
BM Box 3958, London WC1N 3XX

EAST LONDON
PO Box 300, Emma Street, Hackney, London E2 7BZ

HILLINGDON
PO Box 275, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB10 8XU

SOUTH WEST LONDON
BCM Box 5103, London WC1N 3XX

SOUTH EAST LONDON
PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW

BARKING & DAGENHAM
PO Box 12, Dagenham, Essex RM10 7HE

EPPING FOREST
PO Box 12, Loughton, Essex IG10 2DN

WEST KENT
PO Box 48, Tonbridge TN11 9JF

EAST KENT
73 Shirkoak Park, Ashford TN26 3QP

SUFFOLK
2 Albert Road, Framlingham

NORFOLK
9 Johnson Place, Norwich NR2 2SA

MILTON KEYNES
PO Box 311, Bradwell Common, Milton Keynes, Bucks. MK13 8YZ

DEVON
PO Box 1, Torrington EX38 8HQ

SOUTH WALES
PO Box 214, Cardiff CF3 9YB

NORTH WALES
PO Box 3, Llangefni, Anglesey L77 7UY

BIRMINGHAM
PO Box 771, Great Barr, Birmingham B44 9LZ

LEICESTER
PO Box 148, Leicester LE3 2YD

PETERBOROUGH
PO Box 211, Peterborough, Cambs. PE3 8JE

NOTTINGHAM
PO Box 2, Carlton, Nottinham NG4 3EQ

WEST NOTTS.
PO Box 5, Eastwood, Notts. NG16 3RN

NEWARK
PO Box 5, Newark, Notts. NG24 3LD

LIVERPOOL
PO Box 116, Liverpool L69 1SH

MANCHESTER & SALFORD
PO Box 16, Salford M6 5EP

ROCHDALE
PO Box 156, Rochdale, Lancs. OL77 5LG

LEEDS
PO Box BR10, Bramley, Leeds 13

BRADFORD
PO Box 6, Thornton, Bradford BD13 3QF

HUDDERSFIELD
PO Box A43, Huddersfield HD1 4NN

WAKEFIELD
PO Box 101, Wakefield WF2 9XY

DARLINGTON
PO Box 61, Darlington, Co. Durham DL3 9RD

TYNE & WEAR
PO Box 8, South Shields, NE33 1LP

EDINBURGH
PO Box 719, NWDO, Edinburgh EH4 2SR

GLASGOW
PO Box 85, Glasgow G3 8UL

PAISLEY
PO Box 72, Paisley PA2 0BH

DUNDEE
PO Box 161, Dundee DD1 9YR

The BNP also has units in Richmond-on-Thames, Hounslow, Newmarket, Colchester, Gloucestershire, Bristol, Hertfordshire, Reading, Basingstoke, Bedford, Dunstable, Stourbridge, Bolton & Bury, Warrington, Burnley, Blackpool, Halifax, Dewsbury, York, Tees-side, Sunderland, Chester-le-Street, Stirling & Alloa, Greenock, Ayr, Cumbernauld, Aberdeen and Inverness. If you want to contact any of these units, or start a new unit, please write to BNP Head Office at PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

THE GULF WAR
(Contd. from page 2)

could hold the world to ransom by use of the Middle Eastern oil supplies.

You have said that you think concern about oil supplies is "only one" of the purposes behind US and British policy. Could you expand on this?

Yes. In fact I do not believe that US and British political leaders are so wholly lacking in knowledge and common sense that they are incapable of working out the kind of equations I have just given you. If the oil factor were the only factor involved, it is highly doubtful that they would have determined on the vast military operations now taking place in the Gulf region. I believe that there are other factors which weigh much more heavily with them. These are twofold, and are deeply intertwined with each other.

And these are...?

American foreign policy has become the satellite of **Zionist policy** — due to the stranglehold of the Jewish lobby over US internal politics. Similarly, British policy is also heavily influenced by Zionist interests and in addition by the fact of our grovelling and contemptible subservience to America. Zionist power therefore exercises both a direct and indirect influence over Britain: directly by its presence in Britain itself, and indirectly by way of America. This would explain why neither the US nor Britain intervened to stop the Israelis rampaging into the Lebanon a few years ago but are intervenining to stop the Iraqis taking over Kuwait today.

In fact the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait is only a pretext for the US and Britain to get at Saddam Hussein. It is on record that only two days before Saddam marched into Kuwait White House spokeswoman Margaret Tutweiler declared at a news conference in Washington that the United States had no commitment to defend Kuwait from invasion. This now obvious lie suggests that it was American policy right from the outset to entice Saddam Hussein into stepping into Kuwait so as to provide a pretext for the US then to send a force to the Gulf to expel him. In other words, the true purpose was not to protect the sovereignty of Kuwait but to establish an excuse for an American military presence in the Middle East.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the main purpose for this presence is for the United States to provide a permanent guarantee of the existing borders of Israel, themselves no more legitimate than the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait, and possibly even less so — since those Israeli borders encompass Palestinian land acquired by quite recent occupation (Gaza, the West Bank, etc.) while the Iraqi claim on Kuwait dates from the fact that area was undisputed Iraqi territory prior to World War I, after which it was separated from Iraq mainly at the instigation of the British, who then had dominant influence in the area. It could even be said that Saddam was taking back for his country only what we had taken away from it.

Running parallel with the policy of the US of protecting Israel is its policy — again endorsed and supported by our own British Government — of protecting what is fashionably referred to nowadays as the 'world order'. This phrase means something very different from what it is taken to mean by most people; it does not mean simply the general stability of the world; it means precisely the maintenance of the political, economic and ideological dispensation that has dominated international affairs ever since the end of World War II; it means the preservation of the international capitalist, liberal one-world system under which High Finance lords it over the world's nation-states.

Resurgent Islam is seen by the controllers of this system to be the greatest contemporary threat to the system itself, and the military power of Iraq is seen to be one of the bulwarks of resurgent Islam. Therefore, notwithstanding that the military power of Iraq poses no threat to the United States, Britain or any of the other western nations or their vital interests, it has been decreed that the military power of Iraq must be destroyed. Hence the war in the Gulf.

You seem by what you have said here to be in some way sympathetic to Islam. How do you square this with your opposition to presence of Moslems, and of non-Europeans generally, in Britain?

The answer is best summed up in the words of the leader of the French *Front Nationale* Jean-Marie Le Pen, who has said that Europeans should leave the Middle East to the Moslems and Arabs while the Moslems and Arabs should leave Europe to the Europeans. Europe should disengage itself from the quarrels of the Middle East, and Middle Easterners and others should quit Europe. We in the BNP subscribe to this view.

And Israel?

Israel is not the responsibility of Britain, of Europe or of the United States. Israel is the responsibility of the Israelis. The Israelis must sort out their own differences with their Middle Eastern neighbours. After all, these neighbours did not ask the Israelis to set up their state in Palestine; those neighbours had that state forced upon them. The Israelis have made their bed; now they must lie in it.

Redbridge BNP organise to protect community

RAPE, robbery and murder have become common themes on the pages of local papers in Redbridge. It was not so long ago that this borough was considered one of the pleasant, leafy suburbs of London — even being featured in Essex post-cards. But times and people have changed. Three murders within a year, appalling rapes every two or three weeks and six or seven violent muggings per week — often resulting in stab wounds or fractured skulls — are now the norm.

It was against this background of lawlessness and violence directed at local people, and a seeming casualness from the police, that the British National Party's crime-prevention patrol was formed. When the press found out, they hit the roof! ''Vigilantes claim slammed'' was one headline. ''Vigilante extremists have no place here'' was another. Certain senior police officers were upset because they did not like the idea that anyone should want better protection and law and order than they were already getting. BNP spokesman Richard Edmonds was quoted as saying: ''We aim to keep law and order because the police are not up to it.''

The BNP's crime-prevention patrols became a serious embarrassment to the local police, who had been failing to do their jobs properly — something which became known across the whole Metropolitan Police area and to Scotland Yard.

Maybe Ilford police chief John Binder had a kick up the backside from The Yard, but after just three weeks since the revelations about the BNP patrols there were noticeably more policemen on the beat in Redbridge, and the level of street crime had dropped. After four weeks, satisfied that the police were taking their jobs seriously again, the BNP stood its patrols down, claiming complete success for the scheme.

IN THE NEWS

This is a selection of the many local press headlines made by the BNP Redbridge Group through its crime-prevention unit

Predictably, the BNP anti-crime patrols were condemned at a council meeting by all the other parties in the area. At this meeting it almost seemed as if the representatives from these parties were taking the side of the rapists, muggers and murderers. What the council traitors hadn't reckoned on was a BNP demo right inside the council chamber! Dozens of leaflets detailing the horrifying truth about violent crime were strewn around the council chamber and a packed public gallery to shouts of ''Your'e on the side of the criminals.'' This caused an uproar, as the following week's headlines in the local papers made clear. Contrary to some reports in these papers, BNP members were neither ejected nor ushered away; they simply walked out after having made their point.

Redbridge BNP has shown the way. It is possible to organise to protect our communities from the evils stemming from Britain's multi-racial society, and if nothing else it gives us marvellous publicity!

THE WAR; WE WE DO NOT. MAKE COMMON CAUSE WITH THE LEFT
(Contd. from front page)

a British concern. It concerns only those countries occupying the Middle Eastern Region.

That is why we believe that the correct policy would have been for Britain to stay out.

However, our forces have now been sent to the Gulf and are already heavily committed to the battles there. It would be out of the question now for them to be removed at this stage. An attempt must be made to get the war over quickly by the decisive defeat of the Iraqi forces, and every possible backing must be given to our troops in their carrying out of that task.

At the same time we must understand that in the long term the Middle Eastern problem cannot be solved by the western powers and that no good can come of an indefinite western (including British) presence in the area. Should the war turn out to be of very long duration, there will come a point at which we must say that the drain on British lives and the sucking dry of the British economy are no longer worth the candle. At such point we would most certainly be mad not to pull out.

So let us hope that our boys in the Gulf can get it all over soon — and then come home!

THIRD WORLD 'REFUGEE' MADNESS
(Contd. from page 5)

as Sri Lanka, Somalia, Ethiopia, Uganda, Zaire, Ghana, Turkey, Iran, Iraq and India (Wait a minute! Wasn't India supposed to be the world's largest 'democracy'? Surely there can't be any persecution there!).

In fact, it is now becoming evident that it was craziness to believe that distinctions amongst different types of Third World 'refugees' could ever be made. In any case, there never existed the smallest sense in supposing that Britain could take upon herself the refuse of Afro-Asian conflicts, and it was folly to admit liability for any at all.

But the counsels of our liberal 'humanitarians' prevailed. Before long, asylum-seekers, many of them in reality no more than economic gate-crashers, cottoned on to the fact that there was a bleeding-heart brigade in this country which would tumble over itself to fight for their right to stay in Britain once they pushed their way in.

Among others, these included Kurds claiming a right to a place here because the Government of their native Turkey was pushing them around. When some of these were held in Winchester Prison in 1989, for example, local liberal trendies and clerics got up street protests outside the building on their behalf.

Well-heeled as many of these self-styled ''champions of the oppressed'' are, few have ever been noted for doing anything on behalf of their fellow Britons in our inner cities, including old folk, women and children, who have been terrorised in their own neighbourhoods, if not totally uprooted, by the brutal wave of savage muggings, rapes and riots of the 1980s.

Now once again, it is the residents of the inner cities who have to pay the price for the vicarious humanitarianism of our suburban and provincial yuppies who form the vanguard of the 'do-good' brigade.

In early January a major riot broke out in London's East End when 500 largely 'refugee' Turkish and Kurdish sweatshop workers in Hackney (their differences back home forgotten) staged a riot. Stoke Newington Police Station was besieged, 64 arrests were made and 25 policemen were hurt.

The riot, the outcome of a demonstration for ''international proletarian solidarity'' organised to coincide with a strike back in Turkey, is said to have been partly incited by red gangsters from squats in the neighbourhood. Organisers of the 16-hour rampage afterwards accused police of 'torturing' their arrested comrades.

Notwithstanding incidents like these, the Government, as made plain by former Home Secretary David Wadding-ton, does not intend to change the law or break with the UN Convention on refugees.

A country which carries on like this will deserve what it gets. It will also most likely get what it deserves.

VEHICLE FUND: £267.50 STILL NEEDED!

This is to inform readers that £267.50 is still needed to close the BNP Vehicle Fund, which was opened last year with a target figure of £1,200, needed to finance the purchase of a new motor van for party headquarters. The money for the van was borrowed from two London branches and must be paid back.

Contributions to the fund have been very small of late, and we would appreciate it if supporters would dig deeper into their pockets so as to enable us to reach the target figure quickly and close the fund. Please send monies to BNP Vehicle Fund, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW. Please give generously!

What we stand for

- The establishment of a government of national unity that will put an end to nationally-divisive party warfare; the return of leadership and statesmanship to British affairs
- A end to immigration and a start to repatriation
- British withdrawal from the Common Market
- The disbanding of the multi-racial Commonwealth and its replacement by a new Commonwealth of self-governing white states
- British ownership and control of British industry and resources
- Protection of British industry by the selective exclusion of foreign manufactured goods from Britain
- An end to the financial swindle that causes inflation and slump, and its replacement by a sane and fair financial system that will give the people the purchasing power to buy the goods they produce
- The subordination of the power of the City to the power of government, and the harnessing of the City to the needs of British industry
- The regeneration of British farming with the object of achieving the maximum possible self-sufficiency in food production
- A healthy environment for a healthy people — the protection of our countryside and an end to the architectural disfigurement of our towns and cities
- Tougher treatment of criminals, including the return of the death penalty
- An alternative defence strategy: withdrawal from NATO, closure of all foreign military and air bases in Britain, the strengthening of Britain's defences and a position of armed neutrality
- A end to overseas aid and the allocation of the money saved to the financing of repatriation and greater help for the needy at home
- The crushing of the IRA, the termination of the Anglo-Irish Agreement and firm support for the loyalist majority in Northern Ireland
- Repeal of the laws permitting homosexuality and abortion (except where the latter is the result of rape or necessary on medical grounds), the wiping out of AIDS and a return to healthy moral values aimed at strengthening the family and community

WRITE TO US

To: British National Party, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW
(Tick appropriate box):-

Please send me more information, for which I enclose 30p ☐

I wish to become a member and enclose the yearly fee of £12 (half-rate for OAPs and students) ☐

Name.....

Address.....

.....

SPEARHEAD

For an in-depth view of nationalist politics, read *Spearhead*, a 20-page monthly magazine which supports the British National Party. Price 60p. Yearly subscription £11.00. 87p for sample copy to: *Spearhead*, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

BUY *BRITISH NATIONALIST* IN BULK

British Nationalist retails at 25p from your local seller. Would bulk-purchasers order **only** in the quantities listed below. Standing orders welcomed.

10 copies £2.50 + 79p post
25 copies £5.50 + £2.52 post
50 copies £10.00 + £3.15 post
100 copies £17.50 + £3.60 post
150 copies £25.00 + £4.15 post
200 copies £30.00 + £4.80 post
300 copies £42.00 + £6.05 post
400 copies £55.00 + £6.05 post
500 copies £65.00) Bulk rates
1,000 copies £125.00) by Roadline

Cheques/postal orders to *British Nationalist*, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW. Please keep orders and enquiries concerning *British Nationalist* entirely separate from other correspondence so as to avoid delay and confusion.

SUBSCRIBE!

In order to make sure of receiving *British Nationalist* regularly, why not take out a subscription? The rate is £5.40 for 12 issues to subscribers in the British Isles and £7.40 (unsealed surface-mail) to subscribers overseas. Please make cheques/POs payable to *British Nationalist* and send them to: PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

An additional charge of £5.50 is required on all foreign-currency cheques and POs and an additional £2.50 on all foreign currency sent in banknotes.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Printed & published by BN Press, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW